

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 27, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 53-54.

Claims 1-12, 14-24, and 26-55 are currently pending in the application. Claims 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 36-37, 39, 41, 45, 53 and 54 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 1-5, 8, 12, 14-16, 20-24, 26-35, 38, 42-44, 48-52, and 55 have been cancelled without prejudice and disclaimer. Claims 13 and 25 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, 45-47, and 53-54 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 53-54 do not affect the patentability of the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 53-54 are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected claims 50-52 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement (i.e. allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-52 and 55 have been cancelled, and the cancellation

effectively moots the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to claim 4, requesting the Applicants to change “trusted networks” in line 3 to “trusted network” for consistency with singular usage of “trusted network,” in claim 1. While claim 4 has been cancelled, Applicants traverse this objection for at least the following reasons because claims 6-7 and 36-37 use the phrase “trusted networks.”

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 36-37 each recite “wherein the determining if the called party is in a trusted network comprises checking if the address is contained in a database of trusted networks.” The term “database of trusted networks” is separate from the singular term “trusted network” which is also recited in claims 6-7 and 36-37. Thus, the term “trusted networks” when used in the term “database of trusted networks” does not need to be consistent with the term “trusted network.” Furthermore, the specification provides support for a database that contains domain names of trusted networks. (See e.g. Specification at paragraph 0044). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 8, 12, 14-16, 20-24, 26-33, 38, 42-44, and 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over alleged admitted prior art (i.e. paragraphs 0007-0015 of the instant application) (herein “AAPA”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 8, 12, 14-15, 20-24, 26-33, 38, 42-44, and 48-49 have been cancelled, and that the cancellation effectively moots the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 4-5 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA, in view of Donaldson (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,267) (“Donaldson”). The Office Action took the position that AAPA discloses all the elements of the claims with the exception of certain elements. The Office Action then cited Donaldson as allegedly curing the deficiencies of AAPA.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-5 and 34-35 have been cancelled, and that the cancellation effectively moots the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action indicated that claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, and 45-47 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, and 45-47 have been amended so that the claims include all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, and 45-47 be allowed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 6-7,

9-11, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, 45-47, and 53-54 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Mullervy
Registration No. 62,382

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KMM:sew

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 20452 (\$130.00)